

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume XV, Issue No. 5

November 2009

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

ADL defames the patriot movement (again)

By Alex Jones and Paul Joseph Watson

The Anti-Defamation League has launched a new purge against its political enemies in the form of a major report that equates skepticism and distrust of government with "a toxic atmosphere of rage," which is threatening to boil over in the form of violence, specifically targeting [Infowars'] Alex Jones as "The Conspiracy King" and inferring that people upset with Barack Obama's policies are potential mass murderers.

The tone of the ADL's hit piece ["Rage Grows in America: Anti-Government Conspiracies"] basically implies that [Texas radio host] Alex Jones and his ilk are such a threat to the establishment that they should be removed from society, which ironically is exactly how Hitler dealt with his political enemies in Nazi Germany. The ADL is allegorically pinning a yellow star on "conspiracy theorists," Oath Keepers, Tea Party protesters, and anyone else who dares express dissent in response to the financial looting of the country or Barack Obama's big government agenda.

And what does the ADL consider to be the criteria for those it claims are intent on carnage and bloodshed...? A belief that, "There is a conspiracy by malevolent globalists to take over the world and institute a "New World Order".

So essentially by pointing out the fact that UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon writes op-eds for the New York Times calling for "global governance," and highlighting the hundreds of mainstream news reports about the move towards world government and a one world currency which are published

every single day, makes one a dangerous extremist and a crackpot according to the ADL.

Another insane fringe belief according to the ADL is the notion that, "Conspiratorial figures such as "international bankers" and entities ranging from the Federal Reserve to the Council on Foreign Relations to the Bilderberg Group are engaged in a variety of strategies to take over (or extend their hold over) the government and to strip Americans of their rights."

That's right, believing that powerful secretive groups which meet in secret, groups composed of the most influential power brokers on the planet, might talk about ways to expand their power to the detriment of the American people is another "fringe" belief suggesting the individual harboring such thoughts is intent on mass murder.

The ADL attack goes beyond the failed establishment ploy to demonize political opponents of Obama as "racist" and infers that they represent a bubbling undertone of extremism waiting to explode in the form of assassinations of authority figures.

The true significance of this gargantuan hit piece on Alex Jones and the patriot movement is the fact that the establishment has firmly moved away from ignorance and ridicule and is now directly targeting us for elimination – an effective purge of the undesirables – by implying we want to commit violence and should therefore be neutralized by the authorities.

The fact that we have constantly urged unity and discouraged division, while promoting a peaceful message of non-violence, has infuriated the increasingly incensed establishment because as their credibility has collapsed, ours has grown in leaps and

bounds – and as a result their agenda is beginning to stall.

For the first time, the ADL and their cohorts are acknowledging that the grass roots has the power to stop their agenda for world government in its tracks. This represents a massive sea change and proves that we are having an important impact, but it also serves as a warning because it's glaringly obvious that the establishment is now committed to taking us down, either by means of character assassination, set-up, or worse.

The globalists are intent on smearing us as racist, violent, crazies hell-bent on bloodshed – when in reality they are engaged in desperate character assassination because they are petrified at the sheer numbers of people we are waking up to their tyranny.

This isn't the only motive the ADL has in attempting to make the case that there are hordes of angry Americans waiting to commit violence. As Jewish scholar Norman G. Finkelstein exposes in his global bestseller *The Holocaust Industry*, establishment Zionist organizations like the ADL have fleeced billions by manufacturing the perception that there are legions of extremist hate criminals everywhere that need to be tackled by the authorities. The ADL needs to create enemies and bogeymen where none exist in order to justify their own existence and to continue to attract funding....

Addressing the ADL and their cohorts directly, we say this; The people are wise to your game – your pathetic and vacuous smears about white supremacists and violent extremists may have worked in the 1990's but this is a new century and a new era – the

era of humanity reclaiming its spiritual independence and freedom from blood-sucking parasites like you that have attempted to crush free speech at every turn because you are petrified that millions of souls are now beginning to see the true nature of what you represent.

Though you may ultimately tear us down in whatever way you deem necessary, the truth is that ideas are bulletproof, and our legacy will live on through those that come after us while your empire of lies and deceit will inevitably come crashing down as the world emerges into a new age of enlightenment and throws off the chains of slavery imposed on humanity by the process of the dark agenda that you front for. -- www.infowars.com, Nov. 18, 2009

Ssh... a cyborg bug may be listening

Spies may soon be bugging conversations using actual insects, thanks to research funded by the US military.

The US Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency has spent years developing a whole host of cyborg critters, in the hopes of creating the ultimate 'fly on the wall'.

Now a team of researchers led by Hirotaka Sato have created cyborg beetles which are guided wirelessly via a laptop.

Using implants, researchers at the University of California at Berkeley have implanted surveillance equipment into beetles and have worked out how to control their take-off, flight and landing by stimulating the brain to work the wings.

They control turns through stimulating the basilar muscles on one side or the other to make the wings on that side flap harder.

The embedded system uses nerve and muscle stimulators, a microbattery and a microcontroller with transceiver.

They were implanted in the beetles when they were at the pupal stage.

Three types of large beetles from Cameroon were used in the experiments at Berkeley. The smallest was 2cm long, while the largest was 20cm.

According to Professor Noel Sharkey, an international expert on artificial intelligence and robotics from Sheffield University, there have been attempts in the past to control insects

such as cockroaches, but this is the first time the flight of insects has been controlled remotely.

Professor Sharkey questioned the ultimate military application of remotely controlled beetles as you would also need to implant a GPS transmitter and a camera too.

This would be too heavy for even the largest beetle to carry.

The Berkeley researchers suggested the 'cyborg' beetles - part beetle, part machine - could serve as models for micro air vehicles.

Sato and colleagues also said the beetles could serve as couriers to inaccessible locations. The Berkeley team is also experimenting on dragonflies, flies and moths because of their 'unmatched flight capabilities'.

DARPA's ultimate aim is to create cyborg insects that can fly more than 300ft to their target and then stay put until commanded to buzz off again

-- www.dailymail.co.uk, 10/19/09

G-20 summit moves toward global economic control

The International Monetary Fund "walked off with America's economic sovereignty" with agreements reached at the Sept. 20 G-20 summit meeting in Pittsburgh, political analyst Dick Morris declares.

With economic policies adopted at the meeting, "we literally took a gigantic step toward global governance and control by global economists of our monetary and financial and regulatory system," Morris said in a video. "It was incredibly alarming.

"Professional economists around the world run by the IMF are going to work with the G-20 nations to formulate plans for each of their economies and give them specific mandates and specific requirements, and by consensus the G-20 will adopt it.

"Of course the U.S. will participate as one out of 20 votes, and basically be forced to go along with the global consensus. Then every three months the U.S. has to come back to G-20 and the IMF and show that we've been good boys and girls, that we've met our assignments..."

The G-20 grew out of the original G-7, which included only the U.S., the U.K., Canada, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan. Russia joined in 1997.

"But to expand it now to all these other countries is absurd.

"Obviously you needed to include India and China, but beyond that? Argentina? Defaulted on its debt to the IMF. Brazil? That's run by a Marxist. Mexico? That has a huge drug problem.

"South Africa, one of the most corrupt regimes in the world. Saudi Arabia, the single most repressive regime in the world. Indonesia, incredibly unstable. South Korea, a functioning democracy for about 12 years.

"Those are the countries that are going to be sitting in judgment on the U.S. And the IMF will orchestrate all of it.

"Barack Obama gave away the store at that G-20 summit and it's going to be very hard to get it back." --

www.therepublicantemple.com

October 25, 2009

Ending Asset Forfeiture

By Tom Saunders

The U.S. Supreme Court is currently accepting Amicus briefs for *Alvarez v. Smith* which concerns six people whose property was seized by Chicago police, though three of them were never charged with a crime. Police departments all over the United States are getting rich by this illegal process of asset forfeiture, which in effect is a bill of attainder. During oral arguments of *Alvarez*, Judge Sonia Sotomayor asked the pertinent question, "You take the car and *then* you investigate?" "Common Sense", Paul Jacob.)

Preventing punishment without trial or the plunder of Life, Liberty, or Property without legal due process is at the root of American freedom. Yet, organizations like "the National Conference of State Legislatures, the National Association of Counties, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors," according to Jacob, are backing the use of this illegal and unconstitutional practice.

CNN broke the story early March, 2009, about Texas Police stopping people under false pretensions and seizing their valuables and money. The Mayor of Tenaha, Texas has claimed that his police are enforcing the law. Many of the victims were winners in the Shreveport Casinos, where they were virtually victimized by organized waiting 'highway robbers'.

The idea of bills of attainder, and due process are very old in common law. The Christian Apostle

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. – Mark Twain

Paul according to "Acts," saved his life twice from immediate execution by pointing out to Roman soldiers that he was a Roman Citizen and had the right of trial.

Why would Americans want to promote laws that plunder life, liberty, and property?

One, since the Reagan Administration the wave of asset forfeiture laws were sold to the American people in a campaign of fear. They were sold on the idea that asset forfeiture would end the War on Drugs, and protect their children. Millions of dollars are allocated to the American media to promote the hysteria that promotes legalism like asset forfeiture. Legalism protects nobody.

Instead of protecting American rights, this foolish legalism has caused another era of prohibition which has been as deadly as the era of the Volstead Act [that outlawed liquor]. Americans never had it pointed out to them that if asset forfeiture laws exist, Americans lose the 'right' of private property over the right of the government to just take it. Yet, police just 'take' what they want. We, as Americans are being reduced to live in a Police State.

Thomas Cromwell, who ran the Church of England for King Henry VIII, was executed and had his assets taken under a bill of attainder of English law. Cromwell had robbed the Catholic Church with bills of attainder of his own promotion, and this history points to the American Founding Fathers, demanding in the U.S. Constitution, that "no bill of attainder shall be passed." Asset forfeiture is in effect, a punishment without due process and should be banished from American law.

Cummings v. Missouri (1867), states, "A bill of attainder, is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without judicial trial and includes any legislative act which takes away the life, liberty, or property of a particular named or easily ascertainable person or group of persons because the legislature thinks them guilty of conduct which deserves punishment." (Cited in the U.S. Code, as defining Art. 1 Sec. 9., U. S. Constitution: No Bill of attainder or ex post facto Law shall be passed.)

To prohibit bills of attainder means to prohibit the legalism of the Drug War, and prohibit illegal seizures which include illegal roadblocks, and pretentious stops on roadways by police. It will mean stopping seizures and searches that have become common in some places. It will mean

the restoration of the right of private property back to the American citizen.

Unfortunately most legislatures support the idea that 'plunder' should be funneled into the municipality just like in *Tenaha*. In some places municipalities use the eminent domain in *Kelo v. New London* to seize personal assets [i.e., private property that is condemned and given to developers].

I urge Political Activists to 'scream questions' to the organizations listed above, to find out why they would support such illegal acts. These illegal acts can be clearly defined:

"A bill of attainder is a law or legal device used to outlaw people, confiscate their property, punish or, put them to death without trial." (Thomas M. Saunders, Certified Linguist, started the Bill Of Attainder Project '96,' after doing a study through the U.S. Commission On Civil Rights, (CC#93-1-1037), with cooperation from the Justice Department. See also; "Public Safety or Bills of Attainder," by Jon Roland. See also; *Nixon v. Administrator of General Services*, 433 U.S. 425, 468-84, (1977) See also Art. 1. Sect. 9, U.S. Constitution. et al. *United States v. Lovett*, 328 U.S. 303, 315-16, (1946), re: *Yung See Hee*, 36 F. 437 (1888), *McFarland v. American Sugar refining Co.*, 241, U.S. 79, 85-86, (1915) Note: This case deals with 'pains and penalties' as bills of attainder.) See also; Bill of Attainder as used by the Oklahoma Student Legislature.

It is time to make more than the Supreme Court aware that 'yes' they take the car, then investigate. This is an illegal seizure, and an affront to due process. A judge who violates the Constitution, is by law committing treason...if a judge does not fully comply with the Constitution, then his orders are void; in re: *Sawyer*, 124 U.S. 200 (1888), he/she is without jurisdiction, & he/she has engaged in an act or acts of Treason. Perhaps it's time to demand the same principle for legislatures as judges.

The 2010 Census: name and address only

By Paul Galvin

In 2010 the country will go through another census, as authorized by the Constitution (Article I, section 2).

The census provision reads: "The actual Enumeration shall be made within three Years after the first Meeting of the Congress of the United States [March, 1789], and within every subsequent Term of ten Years, in such

Manner as they [Congress] shall by Law direct."

The operative word is "Enumeration," that is, they can count us, but nothing more -- for one purpose only: to apportion the districts of the 435 members of the House Representatives so that each will contain the same number of people.

Readers will note that the Constitution simply authorizes a counting of heads. Not an enumeration by ethnicity or personal relationships. Not an enumeration by one's employment status, health insurance coverage, disability status, education. Not an enumeration of the number of bedrooms, kitchens or cars. Not an enumeration of income or a host of other nosy questions. James Madison's extensive notes on the 1787 Convention contain not one word about the delegates spending any of their valuable time discussing the issues of race, Hispanic origins, personal relationships, or plumbing.

What should we do? Well, we can practice self-government by just giving name & address. We govern ourselves best by following our consensually-adopted Constitution, and demanding that Congress and all federal officials do similarly. LewRockwell.com readers understand that the federal government's creation and its continued existence are subject entirely to the will of the two principals, the people themselves and the states, which allow it to remain in being.

"But," the statists will sputter, "the Constitution says that this counting may be done 'in such Manner as they shall by Law direct,' and that allows us to get further information from and about you." This language merely goes to the mechanics of the count (who will do it; when it is to be done; how, when results are to be reported and so forth). The information requested for the 1790 census -- the number of persons in each household and the "Names of heads of families" (Public Law, March 1, 1790) -- provided Congress with the necessary data to accomplish the first re-apportionment.

Regardless of which census form you receive in the mail (your address is already known), the 10-question short form or the longer American Community Survey form, any busybody question beyond name and address has no bearing for apportionment. The ACS, sent out monthly to selected households, (even though the Constitution expressly authorizes only a single decennial census), is extraordinarily intrusive.

"But," the statist will stammer further, "Congress says you must give all this other information." Perhaps Congress has enacted something along those lines, but that is not to say that that law is itself lawful. The Constitution's Supremacy Clause (Article VI) states that purported federal law is considered authorized law only when made within the framework of the Constitution ("This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, . . ."). Nowhere in *this* Constitution (a document of limitations) is there found any authority enabling Congress to ask about race, ethnicity, or household utility bills.

"But, but, . . . , the necessary and proper clause encompasses these further census questions." Not so. The Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sect. 8) is not an independent grant of power. It is at most a derivative power; before it may be used as justification for a federal law, primary authority must first be located elsewhere. As far as the census is concerned authority is found solely in the Article 1 provision noted above.

Using tired excuses we will be told that government needs this information to function. Really? The Framers didn't think so; otherwise they would have placed that authority in the document. Further, if Congress believes itself in need of additional information, let Congress propose an amendment to the Constitution (as provided for by Article 5) and pitch its case to the creators of the federal government – the people and the states – as to why further, intrusive personal information is needed in order to apportion House representation.

"But, but, . . . , the statist will whine, "amending the Constitution is such a burdensome process. It's so much easier for us to get this information by threatening citizens with fines." To which we simply reply, "We the people expected that you read, understood, and agreed with the written Constitution before you voluntarily took your oath of office to support the people's document. Did you cross your fingers? Is it your intention not to honor your constitutional oath?"

Name, address and number of occupants. The only information to be given in response to any letter or satchel-toting census bureaucrat demanding "Your information, please." We live more freely when all public officials obey the law. Let's begin with the Constitution. --
www.lewrockwell.com/orig10/galvin2.1

True or false? --Test your gun IQ

1. Crime victims often use their personal firearms in self-defense.

TRUE: Many studies indicate that hundreds of thousands of law-abiding U.S. citizens use guns in self-defense. A 1993 national survey conducted by Gary Kleck, Florida State University criminologist, estimated that ordinary gun owners use their weapons to defend themselves at least two million times that year. After Kleck's study, the Department of Justice sponsored a survey in 1994 called *Guns in America: National Survey on Private Ownership and Use of Firearms*. Using a smaller sample size than Kleck's, the survey estimates 1.5 million defensive gun uses annually.

2. Rifles and shotguns are the most commonly owned firearms in the United States.

TRUE: The preference for these shoulder weapons (as opposed to handguns) is rooted in the country's agrarian past and ongoing enthusiasm for hunting and hunting-related sports, according to Kleck. Unlike European nations where a feudal history kept control of hunting land in the hands of the aristocracy, the United States has a history of wide ownership of farmland and millions of acres of public land available for hunting, making the pastime accessible for many ordinary Americans. Widespread gun ownership, then, Kleck notes, predates any push for control over firearms.

3. The U.S. is the most heavily armed society in the world.

TRUE: By all reports, the U.S. is the most armed society in the history of the world. There's a gun of some kind in almost one of every two American households. According to Kleck, at the end of 1999, there were probably more than 260 million guns in private hands in the United States. About 36 per cent of them were handguns.

4. Gun ownership is generally highest in those groups where violence is highest.

FALSE: Quite the opposite. According to Kleck, gun ownership is higher among whites than blacks, among the middle-aged than young, among the rich than poor, in rural areas than urban, patterns that are the reverse of the way that violent criminal behavior is distributed.

5. Only a small percentage of handguns used in violent crimes can be traced to organized gun trafficking organizations.

TRUE: It is true that most criminals get their guns outside of

licensed and regulated channels, but not from gunrunners. According to Kleck's research, such large-scale illicit gun trafficking organizations are rare, and they add only a tiny share (under 1 percent) to the stock of guns available to American criminals. Instead, most criminals acquire their guns through theft (as in a residential burglary) and from private parties as gifts or as purchases from other criminals who have stolen or found a gun).

6. Gun transactions between private citizens are subject to background checks under federal law.

FALSE: There is no federal law requiring checks for such transactions between private citizens, nor is there a national registry of guns or gun owners. However, anyone purchasing a gun of any kind from a licensed dealer must pass a background check for a criminal conviction and other disqualifying attributes. At the same time, a number of federal laws control gun possession: It is unlawful for a convicted felon to purchase a gun or for a dealer to sell a gun to a felon; it is unlawful for any convicted felon to possess a gun of any kind, regardless of how it was obtained; and it is unlawful, everywhere in the United States, for a juvenile to possess a handgun, and unlawful to sell guns to juveniles.

7. Most Americans oppose bans on gun ownership.

TRUE: According to Kleck, most Americans oppose bans on ownership of major categories of guns, but support a wide variety of moderate regulatory measures aimed at keeping guns away from criminals.

8. Since widespread passage of "right to carry" or "shall carry" laws that make it easier for non-criminals to get permits to carry concealed weapons in public, there has been no appreciable increase in acts of violence involving permit holders.

TRUE: Between 1986 and 1998, 22 states amended their gun laws to make it easier for non-criminal adult residents to get permits allowing them to carry concealed firearms in public places. Critics of these laws feared that the increase in legally authorized gun carriers would result in increased acts of violence involving permit holders. But Kleck found statewide data on permit revocations in Florida that indicates that only about eight persons a year had their carry permits revoked due to a gun crime conviction, compared to 194,356 people holding permits on September 30, 1995.

9. Burglars in the U.S. are less willing to enter occupied homes than burglars in other countries.

TRUE: According to Kleck, most Americans take it for granted that a burglar won't burglarize them when they're home. Only about 12 percent of U.S. burglaries take place when people are home, compared to 40 to 50 percent in England, Canada, and the Netherlands, where gun laws are more restrictive and ownership is much lower.

10. Using a gun to resist a criminal is dangerous to your own safety.

FALSE: Kleck has found that no forms of armed resistance provoked criminals into attacking and injuring victims in a substantial number of crimes. When victims who resist are hurt, it usually has been an injury that came first (before the victim tried to resist). Injury after resisting offenders occurred in fewer than 3 percent of all those who resisted, and the few injuries that were inflicted were usually no more serious than cuts and bruises, Kleck found.
-- www.rinr.fsu.edu

"Hustling the Asian brown"

*It is not wise for the Christian white
To hustle the Asian brown;
For the Christian riles
And the Asian smiles
And weareth the Christian down.*

*At the end of the fight
Lies a tombstone white
With the name of the late deceased;*

*And the epitaph drear,
A fool lies here,
Who tried to hustle the East.
-- From The Naulahka, A Story of East
and West, Ch. 5, by Wolcott Balestier
and Rudyard Kipling (1892)*

TSA screening more than just carry-on bags

FORT LAUDERDALE, FLA. --

You might not see them, but they're studying you.

To identify potentially dangerous individuals, the Transportation Security Administration has stationed specially trained behavior-detection officers at 161 U.S. airports. The officers may be positioned anywhere, from the parking garage to the gate, trying to spot passengers who show an unusual level of nervousness or stress.

They do not focus on nationality, race, ethnicity or gender, said TSA spokeswoman Sari Koshetz.

"We're not looking for a type of person, but at behaviors," she said.

Under the program, which started in Boston in 2003, a suspicious passenger might be given a secondary security screening or referred to police; detection officers do not have arrest powers.

Last year, officers nationwide required 98,805 passengers to undergo additional screenings. Police questioned 9,854 of them and arrested 813.

Passengers have been arrested on charges of drug trafficking, possessing fraudulent documents and having outstanding warrants, Koshetz said.

It's not easy to spot detection officers. Working in teams of two and clad in TSA uniforms, they blend in with those performing screening chores at the security checkpoint.

The observation of passengers does not end at the airport.

On an undisclosed number of domestic and international flights, federal air marshals pick up where the behavior detection officers leave off.

The marshals blend in with passengers and work covertly to spot suspicious behavior, said Nelson Minerly, spokesman for the Federal Air Marshal Service, which also falls under the TSA.

The exact number of working air marshals is secret. Minerly noted that they are federal law enforcement officers authorized to arrest and to use lethal force.

Alex Archer, of Sunrise, Fla., a businessman who was flying to Chicago, said he had no objection to being secretly watched.

"Honestly, I haven't even noticed them," he said. "They must be doing a good job. It's better to have more security than not enough." -- Washington Post, November 9, 2009

Claim: BATFE offers illegal U.S. gun registry data to U.N.

Open Letter Oct. 22, 2009

Dear Bureau of Alcohol, Taxation, Firearms and Explosives Acting Director Kenneth Melson:

We at Jews for the Preservation of Firearms Ownership recently received the document that is copied below for your convenience. We would respectfully ask you to either validate these assertions or refute them in detail.

Our organization has had a long and disconcerting experience with the agency you now head. We would suggest that you might seek to bring a refreshing era of candor and honesty...and, if possible, a

substantial dose of legality... to the BATFE. You can certainly start by examining the following carefully compiled expose in detail, and then tell Americans if you are truly planning a national gun registry. (JPFO's open letter continues below following document).

"BATFE Backdoor Registration Scheme"

For nearly 20 years, in violation of 18 U.S.C. 926(a), BATFE has been quietly building a massive **Firearms Registration System for Firearms, Firearm Owners and Firearm Transactions**.

The Firearms Owners' Protection Act, signed into law in 1986, specifically forbids registration of firearms records at 18 U.S.C. 926(a): "No such rule or regulation prescribed after the date of the enactment of the Firearms Owners' Protection Act may require that records required to be maintained under this chapter or any portion of the contents of such records, be recorded at or transferred to a facility owned, managed, or controlled by the United States or any State or any political subdivision thereof, nor that any system of registration of firearms, firearms owners, or firearms transactions or dispositions be established."

When a firearms dealer, importer or manufacturer goes out of business, all the Acquisition/Disposition records (the "Bound Book") kept by the business must be delivered to the BATFE Out-of-Business Center. Currently (according to the 2010 BATFE Budget Submission), over 1.2 million records per month are being received by the BATFE Out-Of-Business Center.

On August 25, 2008, BATFE implemented Ruling 2008-2, allowing Federal Firearms License (FFL) holders to keep the "Bound Book" on a computer. However, when the FFL goes out of business, he must provide a computer file (digital file) and file layout to the ATF Out-of-Business Records Center - in addition to a printout of the "bound A/D book".... including records of antique firearms.

The digital file includes the **Name and Address of every Buyer and every Seller for each gun**, as well as the Name, Make, Model, Caliber and Serial of each firearm. In fact, each set of Out-of-Business digital records is precisely a system of registration of firearms, firearm owners and firearm transactions specifically prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 926(a)....

By 2004, BATFE acknowledged the existence of an automated **Microfilm Retrieval System**

(MRS) containing information on 380 million firearms with an additional 1 million firearms added per month. This system had been enlarged from the previous system (CARS) to contain not only firearm serial number, but manufacturers and importers as well.

More recently (since at least 2005), ATF has been converting microfilmed dealer out-of-business records to "digital images" of the records...**a system of registration of firearms, firearm owners and firearm transactions specifically prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 926(a)...**

BATFE offers on-line access to the records by another system (**eTrace**) on the internet - **world-wide!** BATFE offered access to the eTrace System in United Nations Marking and Tracing Workshops held in Nairobi, Kenya in December, 2007, Lomé, Togo in April, 2008, and Rio de Janeiro in June, 2008. In 2007, BATFE reported some 10,000 individuals representing over 1620 law enforcement agencies around the world (now over 2,000 agencies) had access to our firearms data. Now, information on **your guns (and you!)** is directly available to 10 foreign governments (including those having known corruption issues, such as Mexico and Columbia), and trace requests have been received from 58 foreign governments (some with terrorist connections).

Implications of these registration systems are huge. These records can easily be sorted to report on all buyers of .223 and 5.56mm rifles - or all buyers of .50 BMG rifles, or all purchases by any individual....

BATFE has created a massive **system of registration of firearms, firearm owners and firearm transactions specifically prohibited by 18 U.S.C. 926(a)**. The ultimate goal of such a tracing system is a registration system of every firearm and every firearm owner in the United States.

-- The author is a retired computer professional with over 40 years experience with computers and software.-- (end document)

There you have it, Acting Director Melson. This seems to us to

be a methodical and carefully researched presentation, but perhaps you can prove us wrong.

The reason we at JPFO are making this an open letter, which will be widely disseminated on the Internet, is because BATFE has a sordid history unlike nearly any other Federal agency. The BATFE brought America Ruby Ridge and Waco.

More recently, people now under your leadership blatantly framed David Olofson with light primer ammunition to get his lawful rifle to fire like a machine gun. You, being a forensics expert, should understand more than anybody how patently unlawful and dishonest this testing procedure was, and continues to be

But these travesties, no matter how grave, are truly overshadowed by the ominous plans outlined above. Perhaps you might wonder why concerned, freedom loving Americans would be suspicious of a Federal government that knew where to find every privately owned firearm...and do so with lightning speed and efficiency via a computerized database. And why would you want to share this data with foreign powers? Are we being "hysterical"? Are we being "paranoid"? Frankly, I don't think so

So, Mr. Melson, what is your detailed response to our inquiry? Respectfully,

**Aaron Zelman - Founder
JPFO**

PS. If you wish, we will also provide you with your own personal DVD copy of our documentary entitled "The Gang". This is a concise history of the criminal activity of the agency you now head. We doubt any of your subordinates will share with you much of the information contained in this documentary. "The Gang" will help you understand why so many Americans would, justifiably, like to see the BATFE abolished.

Judge dismisses suit about Obama's eligibility to be president

President Barack Obama may have one less problem to worry about.

A federal judge on Thursday dismissed a lawsuit that claimed Obama is ineligible to be president because he isn't a bona fide U.S. citizen.

The lawsuit represented the claim by the so-called "birthers" movement that Obama was not born in Hawaii - despite a birth certificate to the contrary - or that if he was, his citizenship was invalidated by living overseas as a child.

In a 30-page ruling, U.S. District Judge David O. Carter of California said his court lacked the jurisdiction to rule on a case intended to unseat a sitting president.

Carter's ruling said the plaintiffs were trying to persuade him to "disregard the constitutional procedures in place for the removal of a sitting president."

"The process for removal of a sitting president - removal for any reason - is within the province of Congress, not the courts," the ruling said.

Carter's ruling also noted that the plaintiffs "have attacked the judiciary, including every prior court that has dismissed their claim, as unpatriotic and even treasonous for refusing to grant their requests and for adhering to the terms of the Constitution."

"Respecting the constitutional role and jurisdiction of this court is not unpatriotic," the ruling said. "Quite the contrary, this court considers commitment to that constitutional role to be the ultimate reflection of patriotism."-- CNN Political Ticker, October 29, 2009

* * *

"We fight not for glory nor for wealth nor honour, but only and alone we fight for freedom which no good man surrenders but with his life." - Robert the Bruce (Brus), King of Scots, 24 June 1314

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 783-2375

Wake County, NC, Dave (919) 521-4147

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State ____ Zip _____